A Realization of Network Slices for 5G Networks Using Current IP/MPLS Technologies

draft-ietf-teas-5g-ns-ip-mpls-08

IETF#120, Vancouver
July 2024

K. Szarkowicz (Juniper), R. Roberts (Juniper), J. Lucek (Juniper), M. Boucadair (Orange), L. M. Contreras (Telefonica)

History Log Since IETF#119

- -04 (03/24): WGLC
- -05 (04/24)
  - Changes to address the comments raised during the WGLC period, mainly from Jie and Xuesong, e.g.,
    - Ensure ***better alignment*** with the application I-D
    - Use ***consistent*** terminology
    - Clarify customer of end-to-end slice customer vs. customer (realization)
    - ***Removed NRP*** from the list of transport plane candidate because NRP is not part of "*current IP/MPLS technologies commonly used in operators' networks*«
  - Suggestion to remove the addressing example to a separate document
    - Authors explained that this is ***not about making recommendation***, but ***exemplifying*** a local design that can be used by operators using existing tools
  - **No follow-up since then**

History Log Since IETF#119

- -06 (05/24) to -08 (06/24)
  - Received a thorough review from Adrian
    - ***Document structure and new content***
      - Many changes to enhance the overall document structure.
      - Most of Adrian's suggestions were taken into account (add scalability discussion, etc.)
    - ***Keep or remove the 3GPP Appendix***
      - An LS was sent to 3GPP for review
    - ***Map/Unmap***: Clarified in the draft that binding back a packet received from the TN is not within the scope and classification is the business of the non-TN domain
    - ***Transport plane vs NRP vs Filtered Topology slice***
      - Went with "Inter-PE Transfer Plane" as we need a term to refer to the realization of that part
      - Added new text to explain the link with the concept of "underly-transport" defined in other RFCs
      - Clarified that (multiple) *NRPs can be used but that's out of scope*. This is consistent with the changes made in -05
      - Revealed some confusion about the use of "and" in some RFC 9543 definitions. That discussion can happen as part of the erratum discussion, not this draft
    - **No follow-up from Adrian since 31/05**

History Log Since IETF#119

- -07 (05/24)
  - Comments from Deborah about addressing
    - Deborah ACKed that the revised version is "***clearer on the addressing being local***" but questioned that this might not belong to "existing technologies"
    - Authors clarified that configuring explicit addresses is definitely an ***existing practice***
    - **No follow-up since 05/24. We consider that point closed**
- -08 (06/24)
  - Questions for clarification from Greg about OAM
    - Whether there are gaps in RFC7276 or how to assess isolation objectives
  - Clarified that there are missing tools (e.g., SFC) but the scope is to leverage existing tools
  - No change was needed
  - **ACKed** by Greg (06/24)

Next Steps

- The authors actively engaged with all reviewers to address their comments, make changes, and provide rationale for not making changes, etc.

- The authors believe -08 ready to be sent to the IESG for publication